Degravitation of the Cosmological Constant in Bigravity

Moritz Platscher and Juri Smirnov

Particle and Astroparticle Physics Division, Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

In this article the phenomenon of degravitation of the cosmological constant is studied in the framework of bigravity. It is demonstrated that despite a sizable value of the cosmological constant its gravitational effect can be only mild. The bigravity framework is chosen for this demonstration as it leads to a consistent, ghost-free theory of massive gravity. We show that degravitation takes place in the limit where the physical graviton is dominantly a gauge invariant metric combination. We present and discuss several phenomenological consequences expected in this regime.

arXiv:1611.09385v1 [gr-qc] 28 Nov 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The nature of the cosmological constant (CC) or vacuum energy poses a great challenge since its introduction by Einstein in General Relativity (GR) [1]. After experiments confirmed the accelerated expansion of our universe [2], it was realized that the vacuum energy seems to have a tiny value compared to all known scales in particle physics [3]. This fact is particularly surprising, as it is not protected by any symmetry and is highly sensitive to quantum corrections: any massive particle leads to a loop correction to the value of the vacuum energy, where its mass enters to the fourth power [4]. A large number of attempts were made to explain the smallness of the vacuum energy, for example by symmetry arguments [5]. Furthermore, anthropic arguments for a small value of the CC have been used in the context of the multivese hypothesis [6]. However, a very interesting alternative was suggested in [7], where the fundamental idea relies on the possibility that the vacuum energy could actually not have a small value, but gravitate only very mildly. This is possible in theories where four dimensional gravity is mediated by an effectively massive graviton. In Ref. [7] the analogy to the Higgs phase of electromagnetism is used, where due to non-linear interactions of the goldstone fields the field strength induced by a space-time uniform source is damped and the vacuum is de-electrified. In analogy, a toy system modeling gravity is discussed, where it is suggested that the vacuum energy can be degravitated. A following study of the effect in a non-linear extension of Fierz-Pauli massive gravity suggested that cosmic acceleration can be set by the size of the graviton mass scale [8].

In this work we demonstrate the degravitation of the CC in the framework of bigravity. It

has recently been proven [9–17] that the construction of massive gravity from a bimetric theory suggested in [18, 19] is free of the Boulware-Deser ghost [20]. Thus, we choose this framework as a model of consistent massive gravity to study the degravitation phenomenon. We define a class of models within the bigravity framework in which it can be explicitly shown that above a critical scale r_V, the gravitational effect of the CC is suppressed. The suppression of the gravitational effect of the CC in the limit of a dominantly massive gravitational force mediator is the main result of this work.

This paper is organized in the following way. In Sec. II we briefly describe the bigravity framework, in Sec. III the static spherically symmetric solutions in two different regimes are presented in Subsections III A and III B. The phenomenon of degravitation and additional effects are discussed in Sec. IV, and our results are summarized Sec. V.

II. A CONSISTENT MASSIVE GRAVITY FRAMEWORK

The bigravity framework is based on the introduction of a second metric f, which does not couple directly to the matter fields, but is connected with the usual metric g via an interaction term, explicitly constructed in [10]. It is a non-linear realization of the Stückelberg mechanism which is well-known for the linear theory due to Fierz and Pauli [21, 22]. This construction is designed in such a way that no ghost instabilities arise, even at the non-linear level [11]. On the linearized level it can be shown that two graviton modes are present. A mass-less and a massive mode. The physical graviton is a superposition of these modes and can be either dominantly massive or mass-less, depending on the parameter choice of the corresponding mixing angle. In the limit of zero admixture of the massive mode, Einstein General Relativity is consistently recovered, see [23, 24] for some recent reviews.

The bigravity action for the two tensor fields g and f is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm bi} = \int \mathrm{d}^4x \Bigg\{ & \frac{M_g^2}{2}\sqrt{-|g|}R_g + \frac{M_f^2}{2}\sqrt{-|f|}R_f + \\ & + m^2 M_{\rm eff}^2 \sqrt{-|g|}\sum_{n=0}^{4}\beta_n e_n(\mathbb{X}) + \sqrt{-|g|}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\rm matter} + M_g^2\Lambda\right)\Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, M_g is the Planck scale for the g metric, M_f the Planck scale for the f metric and $M_{\rm eff}^2 = \left(\frac{1}{M_g^2}+\frac{1}{M_f^2}\right)^{-1}$, and $\mathbb{X}$ is defined as $\mathbb{X}^\mu_\alpha\mathbb{X}^\alpha_\nu = g^{\mu\alpha}f_{\alpha\nu}$. Note that, while the vacuum energy Λ of the metric g is kept explicitly, the corresponding CC of f is contained in the interaction term and proportional to the graviton mass. This distinction is made, to emphasize that we view Λ as the

source of the gravitational field, which is renormalized by loops of matter fields coupling to g. This action describes obviously a class of theories with arbitrary parameters β_i. We will demonstrate in the next section that in order to obtain analytical solutions which show degravitation a subclass of theories is singled out by appropriate choice of the constants β_i.

By varying the action with respect to g and f, we obtain two sets of Einstein equations:

$$G(g)_{\mu\nu} + m^2 \sin^2(\theta) \sum_{n=0}^{3} \beta_n V^{(n)}(g)_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G_N T_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}, \tag{2a}$$

$$G(f)_{\mu\nu} + m^2 \cos^2(\theta) \sum_{n=1}^{4} \sqrt{\frac{|g|}{|f|}} \beta_n V^{(n)}(f)_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{2b}$$

where $\sin^2(\theta) = \frac{M_{\rm eff}^2}{M_g^2}$, $\cos^2(\theta) = \frac{M_{\rm eff}^2}{M_f^2}$, and the interaction or mass terms $V(g/f)$ follow from the variation of the polynomials e_n. For more details on the structure of the interaction terms we refer the reader to Appendix A.

In addition, energy-conservation must be ensured by demanding the vanishing of the covariant derivative of Eq. (2):

$$\nabla(g)_\mu G(g)^\mu{}_\nu = \nabla(g)_\mu T^\mu{}_\nu = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \nabla(g)_\mu V^{(n)}(g)^\mu{}_\nu = 0. \tag{3}$$

Equivalently, we find for the f-metric $\nabla(f)_\mu \left(\sqrt{\frac{|g|}{|f|}} V^{(n)}(f)^\mu{}_\nu \right) = 0$. These two additional equations are known as Bianchi constraints. However, the equations obtained for g and f are in general *not* independent.

In the linearized regime of the theory, it can be demonstrated that two spin-2 modes, a massive and a mass-less one are propagated in the theory. In the parametrization chosen here, Einstein GR with a dominantly mass-less mediator is recovered for $\theta \to 0$, and the opposite limit $\theta \to \pi/2$ leads to a dominantly massive physical graviton. A central point is that the massive mode, which is proportional to the combination $\delta g_{\mu\nu} - \delta f_{\mu\nu}$ is invariant under diffeomorphisms acting in the same way on g and f. This makes the massive perturbation a gauge invariant observable [25]. We are tempted to embrace the principle of gauge invariance as the determining principle for the construction of physically observable quantities. Already at this stage of the analysis one can provide a physical argument that, in the limit that this combination is dominantly coupling to matter, any space-time uniform source must decouple, as otherwise its presence would lead to an unbounded growth of a quantity which is a gauge invariant physical observable, thus leading to a paradox. We will now demonstrate this behavior explicitly in a spherically symmetric system.

III. STATIC SPHERICALLY SYMMETRIC SOLUTION

We will study a spherically symmetric system with a massive source at the center and containing a space-time uniform energy density, the CC. Since we are interested in the regime far outside the localized source, we choose an ansatz for the metric, which is convenient for the weak field expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{d}x^\mu\mathrm{d}x^\nu &= -e^{\nu_1(r)}\mathrm{d}t^2 + e^{\lambda_1(r)}\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2, \\ f_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{d}x^\mu\mathrm{d}x^\nu &= -e^{\nu_2(r)}\mathrm{d}t^2 + e^{\lambda_2(r)}(r+r\mu(r))'^2\mathrm{d}r^2 + (r+r\mu(r))^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

This exponential ansatz is inspired by Ref. [26] and the exponentials are expanded to leading order in small potential functions ν_i and λ_i. The function μ can be thought of as a relative "twist" in the metrics and is a measure of non-linearities induced by the interaction of the metrics. [1]

A. The Linear Regime

We assume that at large distances from the source the non-linearities are sub-dominant and expand the equations assuming $\mu \ll 1$.

The resulting Einstein equations and Bianchi constraints can be solved exactly, as demonstrated in Appendix B 1. The respective potential functions read

$$\nu_1(r) = -\left[\frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\text{eff}}\right] + \sin^2(\theta)\left(\frac{C_2\, e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}}{r} - \frac{2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{m^2\alpha_1}\right) + C_3, \tag{5a}$$

$$\lambda_1(r) = \frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\text{eff}} - \sin^2(\theta)\,\frac{C_2 e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}\left[1+mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}\right]}{2r}, \tag{5b}$$

$$\nu_2(r) = -\left[\frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\text{eff}}\right] - \cos(\theta)^2\left(\frac{C_2\, e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}}{r} - \frac{2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{m^2\alpha_1}\right) + C_3, \tag{5c}$$

$$\lambda_2(r) = \frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\text{eff}} + \cos(\theta)^2\frac{C_2\, e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}\left[1+mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}\right]}{2r}, \tag{5d}$$

with undetermined integration constants $C_{1,2,3,4}, \widetilde{\Lambda}$. With the constants $\alpha_1 \equiv \beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3$, $\alpha_2 \equiv \beta_0 + 3\beta_1 + 3\beta_2 + \beta_3$, and $\alpha_3 \equiv \beta_2 + 2\beta_3$ the potentials have the structure of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution with a superposition of a Yukawa potential and the induced effective vacuum energy $\Lambda_{\text{eff}} \equiv \left[\Lambda + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3)\right]$. We note that already at this stage it is obvious that in the limit of the physical graviton being dominantly the massive mode, i.e. $\cos(\theta) \to 0$, the terms in the potential functions proportional to r^2 are suppressed. This demonstrates that the strength of the space-time uniform source field Λ does not have any physical effect in this limit.

[1] See e.g. [27] for a more general treatment of black hole solutions in bigravity.

The function μ can be obtained by solving Eq. (B5):

$$\mu(r) = \frac{C_2\, e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}\left[1 + mr\sqrt{\alpha_1} + m^2 r^2 \alpha_1\right]}{4m^2 r^3 \alpha_1} + \frac{m^2\alpha_1 C_0 - 2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{6m^2\alpha_1} + \frac{C_4}{r^3}\,. \tag{6}$$

It is interesting to observe that the form of the metric twist measuring the non-linear effect is independent of the graviton mode mixing. A very important question which needs to be addressed is the range of scales at which this approximation is valid. This can be read of the function $\mu(r)$ provided the integration constants can be determined. Thus to obtain those, we will solve the non-linear equations for radii smaller than the critical radius we call r_V in the next section and perform a matching of the solutions.

B. The Non-Linear Regime

We are now interested in the form of the solution inside the Vainshtein radius r_V [28]. This is the scale below which non-linearities are supposed to become relevant, resolving many of the apparent issues related to massive gravity [29–32]. The equations of motion can be simplified under the additional assumption that $r_V \ll \lambda_g \equiv 1/(\sqrt{\alpha_1} m)$, which turns out to be equivalent to the condition that the Schwarzschild radius is smaller than the graviton's Compton wavelength i.e. $r_S \ll \lambda_g$. This yields the following equation:

$$\frac{2\left(r + r\mu(r)\right)'\left(\lambda_1(r) - \lambda_2(r)\right)}{\left(r + r\mu(r)\right)'\nu_1'(r) - \nu_2'(r)} = r\frac{\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_4\,\mu(r) + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_4)\mu(r)^2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_4\,\mu(r)}\,, \tag{7}$$

where $\alpha_4 \equiv \beta_2 + \beta_3$.

Choosing $\alpha_3 = 0$ and $\alpha_4 = -\alpha_1$, one obtains very compact solutions inside the Vainshtein radius r_V as shown in Appendix B 2:

$$\nu_1(r) = -\lambda_1(r) = -\frac{r_S}{r} - \frac{r^2}{3}\left[\Lambda + m^2\sin^2(\theta)\left(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2\right)\right] = -\frac{r_S}{r} - \frac{r^2}{3}\Lambda_{\rm eff}\,, \tag{8a}$$

$$\nu_2(r) = -\lambda_2(r) = -\frac{2}{3}\,\alpha_1 m^2 r^2\cos^2(\theta)\,. \tag{8b}$$

We observe that the potential of the g metric which couples to matter reproduces the GR Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution with an induced CC with contributions from the bare CC and the graviton mass. In the limit of $\theta \to 0$ this expression reproduces standard GR.[2]

[2] Note that this limit is continuous in the sense that all massive d.o.f. decouple [33]. This is different from the $m \to 0$ where the so-called van Dam-Veltman-Zakharov discontinuity [34, 35] occurs: for a given source, the helicity-0 mode does not decouple, when $m \to 0$, as can be seen from Eq. (11).

The linear and non-linear solutions can be matched at r_V, as shown in Appendix B 3, leading to

$$C_0 \Rightarrow \widetilde{\Lambda} = 0, \quad C_1 = r_S \cos^2(\theta)\left(1+\frac{2}{3}\sin^2(\theta)\right), \quad C_2 = -2\, r_S \frac{\Lambda + m^2\alpha_1 + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(3\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}{3m^2\alpha_1},$$
$$C_3 = -\cos^2(\theta) m\sqrt{\alpha_1} C_2, \quad C_4 = r_S \frac{5\Lambda + 3\alpha_1 m^2 + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(7\alpha_1+5\alpha_2)}{6\alpha_1^2 m^4}, \tag{9}$$

with r_S being the Schwarzschild radius of the central matter distribution.

As already mentioned the linearity assumption $\mu \ll 1$ is violated as $r \to 0$. With the matched coefficients it is clear under which condition the function μ is small: we can read of that if

$$r \gg \left(\frac{r_S}{m^2\,\alpha_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \equiv r_V\,, \tag{10}$$

the assumption $\mu \ll 1$ is justified and we are indeed in the linear regime. This condition defines the scale r_V and justifies our initial expansion in $\mu(r) \ll 1$ *a posteriori*.

After the matching we obtain the following physical gravitational potential:

$$\nu_1(r) = \begin{cases} -\frac{r_S}{r} - r^2\,\frac{\Lambda_{\rm eff}}{3} & r \ll r_V \\ -\frac{r_S}{r}\left[\cos^2(\theta)\left(1+\frac{2}{3}\sin^2(\theta)\right) + \frac{2}{3}\sin^2(\theta) e^{-m\sqrt{\alpha_1}\,r}\left(1+2\sin^2(\theta)+\frac{\Lambda_{\rm eff}}{m^2\alpha_1}\right)\right] - & \\ -r^2\cos^2(\theta)\,\frac{\Lambda_{\rm eff}}{3} & r \gg r_V\,. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

The derivation of this potential is the main result of this work. It demonstrates that inside the Vainshtein radius we have the known Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution with the induced CC $\Lambda_{\rm eff} = \Lambda + m^2\sin^2(\theta)\,(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)$. On the other hand, inside the Vainshtein radius, the longitudinal modes become strongly coupled [36]. Here, the induced CC is $\Lambda_{\rm eff}^{\rm outer} = \cos(\theta)^2\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ which is suppressed in the massive limit $\cos(\theta) \to 0$. Also, in the massive limit the outer potential is of Yukawa type. The induced CC has a contribution from the bare CC and the one induced by the graviton mass effect. It is important to notice that the graviton mass contribution can flip the sign of the induced CC, and reduce the value of $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ even if the bare Λ is large.

At this point, we may finally describe how degravitation works in the bigravity framework. Taking the limit of a purely massive graviton coupling to matter, i.e. $\sin\theta = 1$ and $\cos\theta = 0$, we see that the potential inside the Vainshtein radius is purely newtonian *with* an effective CC, while outside r_V we have a Yukawa potential $e^{-m_g r}/r$ with the effective CC *decoupled*. Therefore, we see that we have found the scale above which the vacuum energy density is degravitated. This is a remarkable result and to our knowledge has not been pointed out in the literature so far within

this framework and represents a genuine realization of the mechanism described in Ref. [7] within a UV complete theory of massive gravity.

IV. DEGRAVITATION AND INDUCED EFFECTS

We will now present some phenomenological implications of our findings. As discussed in the introduction, the theoretical expectation for the bare value of Λ is large due to effects of vacuum loops and phase transitions in the universe.

From the form of Eq. (11), we observe that there are two effects at work in massive gravity. On the one hand we demonstrate how degravitation as suggested by Dvali et al. [7] works in the linear regime. This phenomenon is manifest in the limit $\cos(\theta) \to 0$, which corresponds to the dominance of the massive mode. In this limit the potential outside the Vainshtein radius is a pure Yukawa potential and the space-time uniform contribution of the CC decouples. Thus in this long range effect there is no fine tuning involved as an arbitrary value of $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ gravitates arbitrarily mildly, as long as $\cos(\theta)$ is small enough.

On the other hand, inside the Vainshtein radius, there is always a remaining effect of the CC. The exact value of $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ given that $\sin(\theta) \neq 0$ can be set to any value in principle. However, if the bare CC Λ is very large and the mass parameter m small, then given a fixed value of the graviton mass $m\sqrt{\alpha_1}$, there is a large α_2 needed in order to keep $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ in agreement with solar system observations. Thus, depending on the value of the bare CC, there might be some fine-tuning of α_2 needed at this point, unless there is a symmetry principle keeping the total $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ naturally small.

At this point it is also important to comment on a curious fact. In practice, whenever limits on the graviton mass or the value of the CC are set from solar system observations, each effect is treated separately. However, we showed that those two effects are intrinsically intertwined in such a way that they cannot be kept apart inside the Vainshtein radius. Therefore, on the one hand the limits we obtain from planetary orbits are limits on the combination $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$. On the other hand, the distance scale we consider those observations at sets a limit on the Vainshtein radius and hence on the graviton mass.

The vast majority of known objects in the solar system are inside the Kuiper belt, which has a 50 AU radius. We observe that in the degravitating regime, it is unacceptable that the Vainshtein radius of the solar system is smaller than its size. As the gravitational law would change significantly on very well studied scales, contradicting observations [see Eqn. (11)]. If the Vainshtein radius of the solar system is taken to be larger than the radius of the Kuiper belt, we obtain a graviton

mass bound of $m_g = m\sqrt{\alpha_1} < 5 \cdot 10^{-25}$ eV. This bound is a conservative estimate and is slightly stronger than the solar system bound reported in [37], where a generic expanded Yukawa potential has been considered. However, both bounds are significantly lower than the upper mass bound obtained from cluster observations, $m_g < 10^{-29}$ eV [37].

Having established that in the degravitating regime the Vainshtein radius has to be outside the solar system, we can set a limit on $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$. The limit which can be obtained on the value of $\Lambda_{\rm eff} = (\rho^{\rm vac}_{\rm induced})/M_p^2$ from the perihelion rotation of Mercury is $\rho^{\rm vac}_{\rm induced} < (14\ {\rm eV})^4$ [4]. This value is sixteen orders of magnitude larger than the one obtained from late time acceleration $\rho^{\rm vac}_{\rm asymptotic} < \left(1.8 \cdot 10^{-3}\ {\rm eV}\right)^4$. Nevertheless, it is still significantly smaller than, for example the value one expects to be added to the CC from the QCD phase-transition. Thus, there seems to be some level of fine-tuning involved in the value of the constant α_2.

At the same time assuming that we are in the degravitation regime a lower bound on the mixing angle can be obtained. Assuming that $\Lambda_{\rm eff}$ saturates the solar system bounds inside the Vainshtein radius and knowing that the value of the asymptotic CC on the largest scales leads to $\rho^{\rm vac}_{\rm asymptotic} \approx \left(1.8 \cdot 10^{-3}\ {\rm eV}\right)^4$, we can infer that $\cos(\theta) > 1.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$.

If indeed our universe is close to the degravitated regime, we see from (11) that unavoidably the gravitational potential is modified at the transition around the Vainshtein radius and is enhanced by a leading order factor

$$C \approx \frac{2\sin^2(\theta)}{3}\left(1 + 2\sin^2(\theta) + \frac{\Lambda_{\rm eff}}{\alpha_1 m^2}\right) \approx \frac{2}{3}\left(3 + \frac{\Lambda_{\rm eff}}{\alpha_1 m^2}\right). \tag{12}$$

This effect is due to the fact that below the Vainshtein radius the longitudinal modes of the gravitons are strongly coupled and do not contribute. However, at the transition to the linear regime those modes become active and lead to an enhanced force. The enhancement could lead to observable deviations from Einstein gravity at scales larger than the Vainshtein radius of a given system. For example for the Andromeda galaxy with $1.5 \cdot 10^{12}$ solar masses and given the cluster bound on the graviton mass, the critical radius r_V would be larger than 4 kilo-parsec. Thus deviations from pure GR behavior are expected to be only observable in large systems as galaxies or clusters where the effects appear above the kilo-parsec length scale.

To test the degravitation hypothesis gravitational lensing measurements might be more sensitive. The deflection angle outside the Vainshtein radius is approximately given by

$$\Delta\phi \approx \frac{r_S\left(3\left(\sin^2(\theta)\left(\Lambda_{\rm eff} + \alpha_1 m^2\right) + 2\alpha_1 m^2\right) - 2\alpha_1 m^2 \sin^2(\theta)\cos^2(\theta)\right)}{3\alpha_1 m^2 r_i}, \tag{13}$$

where r_i is the distance at which the light is passing by the source. The expression has the limiting

behaviors

$$\Delta\phi \to \frac{2r_S}{r_i} \qquad \text{for } \theta \to 0\,, \text{ GR limit} \tag{14a}$$

$$\Delta\phi \to \frac{r_S}{r_i}\left(3 + \frac{\Lambda_{\text{eff}}}{\alpha_1 m^2}\right) \qquad \text{for } \theta \to \frac{\pi}{2}\,, \text{ massive gravity limit}\,. \tag{14b}$$

In conclusion, we find that in the regime leading to degravitation substantial deviations from the GR light deflection are expected at large distance scales. We leave a detailed phenomenological survey for future work.

V. SUMMARY

In this article we have demonstrated the effect of degravitation in a concrete model of massive gravity. We have shown that, in the limit where the physical gravity mediator is dominantly a massive gauge invariant mode, the effect of a space-time uniform source coupled to the physical metric is suppressed. We emphasize that in the degravitating regime, limits on the graviton mass have to be set in a different way, as the gravitational law changes substantially at the Vainshtein radius, a critical length scale we defined in the theory. Furthermore, we comment on the possibility to test the degravitation hypothesis by measuring deviations of the gravitational potential and light deflection at scales larger than this critical scale.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Matthias Bartelmann for invaluable discussions and comments on the manuscript. MP is supported by IMPRS-PTFS.

Appendix A: Einstein Equations in Bigravity

Let us briefly discuss the details of obtaining the field equations for the tensor fields g and f from the action (1). There, the e_n are the elementary symmetric polynomials of the eigenvalues of the matrix $\mathbb{X}$. These can be expressed as

$$e_0 = 1, \tag{A1a}$$

$$e_1 = \text{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}\right), \tag{A1b}$$

$$e_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[\text{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}\right)^2 - \text{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^2\right)\right], \tag{A1c}$$

$$e_3 = \frac{1}{6}\left[\mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})^3 - 3\,\mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})\,\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^2\right) + 2\,\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^3\right)\right], \tag{A1d}$$

$$e_4 = \det(\mathbb{X}). \tag{A1e}$$

The variation of the action (1) w.r.t. g yields the interaction terms

$$V^{(0)}(g)^\mu{}_\nu = \delta^\mu{}_\nu, \tag{A2a}$$

$$V^{(1)}(g)^\mu{}_\nu = \mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})\,\delta^\mu{}_\nu - \mathbb{X}^\mu{}_\nu, \tag{A2b}$$

$$V^{(2)}(g)^\mu{}_\nu = \left(\mathbb{X}^2\right)^\mu{}_\nu - \mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})\,\mathbb{X}^\mu{}_\nu + \frac{\delta^\mu{}_\nu}{2}\left[\mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})^2 - \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^2\right)\right], \tag{A2c}$$

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(3)}(g)^\mu{}_\nu = &- \left(\mathbb{X}^3\right)^\mu{}_\nu + \mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})\left(\mathbb{X}^2\right)^\mu{}_\nu - \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})^2 - \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^2\right)\right]\mathbb{X}^\mu{}_\nu + \\ &+ \frac{\delta^\mu{}_\nu}{6}\left[\mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})^3 - 3\,\mathrm{tr}\,(\mathbb{X})\,\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^2\right) + 2\,\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{X}^3\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{A2d}$$

The expressions for $V^{(1,2,3)}(f)$ are obtained from these by dropping the parts proportional to $\delta^\mu{}_\nu$ and multiplying by (-1), while for $n = 4$, one obtains $V^{(4)}(f) = \delta^\mu{}_\nu$.

Appendix B: Spherically symmetric and static black hole solution

In this appendix we discuss how to obtain the solution to the classical, weak-field potential given in Eq. (11). Our starting point is the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{d}x^\mu\mathrm{d}x^\nu &= -e^{\nu_1(r)}\mathrm{d}t^2 + e^{\lambda_1(r)}\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2, \\ f_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{d}x^\mu\mathrm{d}x^\nu &= -e^{\nu_2(r)}\mathrm{d}t^2 + e^{\lambda_2(r)}(r + r\mu(r))'^2\mathrm{d}r^2 + (r + r\mu(r))^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2, \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

which we plug into the Einstein Equations derived in the previous appendix.

1. The Linear Regime

At large distances from the source, one assumes a space-time which is nearly flat, such that in addition, we take $\mu \ll 1$. With this assumption we obtain the following linearized Einstein equations:

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{r^2} + \frac{\lambda_1'}{r} = \Lambda_g + m_g^2\left[\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) + \left(3\mu + r\mu'\right)\right], \tag{B2a}$$

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{r^2} - \frac{\nu_1'}{r} = \Lambda_g + m_g^2\left[\frac{1}{2}(\nu_2 - \nu_1) + 2\mu\right], \tag{B2b}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda_1'}{r} - \frac{\nu_1'}{r} - \nu_1''\right) = \Lambda_g + m_g^2\left[\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 + \nu_2 - \nu_1) + \left(2\mu + r\mu'\right)\right] \tag{B2c}$$

with $m_g^2 = m^2\alpha_1 \sin(\theta)^2$ and $\Lambda_g = \Lambda + m^2\alpha_2 \sin(\theta)^2$ for the g metric. And similarly for the f metric:

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{r^2} + \frac{\lambda_2'}{r} = \Lambda_f + m_f^2 \left[\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) - \left(3\mu + r\mu'\right)\right], \tag{B3a}$$

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{r^2} - \frac{\nu_2'}{r} = \Lambda_f + m_f^2 \left[\frac{1}{2}(\nu_1 - \nu_2) - 2\,\mu\right], \tag{B3b}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda_2'}{r} - \frac{\nu_2'}{r} - \nu_2''\right) = \Lambda_f + m_f^2 \left[\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \nu_1 - \lambda_2 - \nu_2) - \left(2\mu + r\mu'\right)\right]. \tag{B3c}$$

with $\Lambda_f = m^2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3)\cos^2(\theta)$ and $m_f^2 = m^2\alpha_1 \cos^2(\theta)$. We have defined $\alpha_1 \equiv \beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3$, $\alpha_2 \equiv \beta_0 + 3\beta_1 + 3\beta_2 + \beta_3$, and $\alpha_3 \equiv \beta_2 + 2\beta_3$ and for the sake of compactness of the expressions fixed $\beta_4 = 0$. On the one hand, this does not change the physical potentials and implies that the f metric (which does not couple to matter) has only an effective vacuum energy contribution proportional to the graviton mass.

The independent Bianchi constraints read

$$\lambda^{(-)} - \frac{r}{2}\nu^{(-)\prime} = 0, \tag{B4a}$$

$$\lambda^{(-)\prime} + \nu^{(-)\prime} - 8\mu' - 2r\mu'' = 0\,. \tag{B4b}$$

Here, we have introduced the notation $\lambda^{(-)} \equiv \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ and $\nu^{(-)} \equiv \nu_1 - \nu_2$. We can integrate (B4b), using (B4a), and obtain

$$\left(r^3\mu\right)' = \frac{r}{4}\left(r^2\nu^{(-)}\right)' + \frac{C_0\, r^2}{2} \tag{B5}$$

This may be used to simplify the square brackets in Eqs. (B2a) and (B3a):

$$\mp\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{(-)} \pm \left(3\mu + r\mu'\right) = \mp\frac{r}{4}\nu^{(-)\prime} \pm \frac{1}{4r}\left(2r\nu^{(-)} + r^2\nu^{(-)\prime}\right) \pm \frac{C_0}{2} = \pm\frac{1}{2}\nu^{(-)} \pm \frac{C_0}{2}. \tag{B6}$$

Subtracting Eqs. (B2a) and (B3a) yields

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\left(r\lambda^{(-)}\right)' = \frac{1}{r^2}\left(\frac{r^2}{2}\nu^{(-)\prime}\right)' = \widetilde{\Lambda} + \frac{m^2\alpha_1}{2}\nu^{(-)}, \tag{B7}$$

with $\widetilde{\Lambda} \equiv \Lambda + m^2\left(\alpha_1 C_0/2 + \sin^2(\theta)\alpha_2 - \cos^2(\theta)\left(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3\right)\right)$. This equation has the general solution

$$\nu^{(-)}(r) = -\frac{2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{m^2\alpha_1} + \frac{C_2}{r}e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}, \tag{B8a}$$

$$\Rightarrow\ \lambda^{(-)}(r) = -\frac{C_2\left[1 + mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}\right]}{2r}e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}, \tag{B8b}$$

where Eq. (B4b) has to be used. Note that here the exponentially divergent branch has not been considered.

Similarly, we can consider the linear combination $\lambda^{(+)} \equiv \cos(\theta)^2\lambda_1 + \sin^2(\theta)\lambda_2$ which, using Eqs. (B2a) and (B3a), obeys the differential equation

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\left(r\lambda^{(+)}\right)' = \cos(\theta)^2\left[\Lambda + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3)\right] \tag{B9}$$

and may be integrated to yield

$$\lambda^{(+)}(r) = \frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos(\theta)^2\Lambda_{\rm eff}, \tag{B10}$$

with $\Lambda_{\rm eff} \equiv \left[\Lambda + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3)\right]$.

Finally, from Eqs. (B2b) and (B3b), one may find $[\nu^{(+)} \equiv \cos(\theta)^2\nu_1 + \sin^2(\theta)\nu_2]$

$$\nu^{(+)}(r) = -\left[\frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos(\theta)^2\Lambda_{\rm eff} - C_3\right]. \tag{B11}$$

Thus, we find

$$\nu_1(r) = \nu^{(+)}(r) + \sin^2(\theta)\,\nu^{(-)}(r) = -\left[\frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\rm eff}\right] + \sin^2(\theta)\left(\frac{C_2\,e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}}{r} - \frac{2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{m^2\alpha_1}\right) + C_3, \tag{B12a}$$

$$\lambda_1(r) = \lambda^{(+)}(r) + \sin^2(\theta)\,\lambda^{(-)}(r) = \frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\rm eff} - \sin^2(\theta)\,\frac{C_2 e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}\left[1+mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}\right]}{2r}, \tag{B12b}$$

$$\nu_2(r) = \nu^{(+)}(r) - \cos(\theta)^2\nu^{(-)}(r) = -\left[\frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\rm eff}\right] - \cos(\theta)^2\left(\frac{C_2\,e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}}{r} - \frac{2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{m^2\alpha_1}\right) + C_3, \tag{B12c}$$

$$\lambda_2(r) = \lambda^{(+)}(r) - \cos(\theta)^2\lambda^{(-)}(r) = \frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{r^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta)\Lambda_{\rm eff} + \cos(\theta)^2\,\frac{C_2\,e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}\left[1+mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}\right]}{2r}. \tag{B12d}$$

The function μ can be obtained by integrating Eq. (B5):

$$\mu(r) = \frac{C_2\,e^{-mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}}\left[1+mr\sqrt{\alpha_1}+m^2r^2\alpha_1\right]}{4m^2r^3\alpha_1} + \frac{m^2\alpha_1C_0 - 2\widetilde{\Lambda}}{6m^2\alpha_1} + \frac{C_4}{r^3}\,. \tag{B13}$$

2. The Non-Linear Regime

If we assume that $r_V \ll \lambda_g \equiv 1/(\sqrt{\alpha_1}m)$, which is equivalent to the condition that $r_S \ll \lambda_g$, the equations of motion can be integrated assuming that $\beta_4 = 0$, as discussed in Ref. [26]. We generalize this procedure to a non vanishing CC and obtain from the Bianchi constraint

$$\frac{2\left(r+r\mu(r)\right)'\left(\lambda_1(r)-\lambda_2(r)\right)}{\left(r+r\mu(r)\right)'\nu_1'(r)-\nu_2'(r)} = r\frac{\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_4\,\mu(r) + (\alpha_3-\alpha_4)\mu(r)^2}{\alpha_1+\alpha_4\,\mu(r)}, \tag{B14}$$

together with the integrated expressions for the potential functions,

$$\nu_1'(r) = \frac{r_S}{r^2} - \frac{2}{3}\Lambda_g r + \frac{1}{3}m^2 r \sin^2(\theta)\mu(r)\left[-3\alpha_1 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_4)\mu(r)^2\right] , \tag{B15a}$$

$$\lambda_1(r) = \frac{r_S}{r} + \frac{1}{3}\Lambda_g r^2 + \frac{1}{3}m^2 r^2 \sin^2(\theta)\mu(r)\left[3\alpha_1 + 3\alpha_4\mu(r) + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_4)\mu(r)^2\right] , \tag{B15b}$$

$$\nu_2'(r) = -\left[\frac{2}{3}\Lambda_f\, r + m^2 r \cos^2(\theta)\mu(r)\left(\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_3\mu(r) + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_4)\mu(r)^2\right)\right]\frac{(r + r\mu(r))'}{(1+\mu(r))^2} , \tag{B15c}$$

$$\lambda_2(r) = \left[\frac{1}{3}\Lambda_f\, r^2 + m^2\cos^2(\theta) r^2 \mu(r)\left(\alpha_3 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_4)\mu(r)\right)\right](1+\mu(r))^{-1} \tag{B15d}$$

a seventh order algebraic equation for $\mu(r)$, where $\alpha_4 \equiv \beta_2 + \beta_3$. Note that the integration constants have been chosen from the continuity condition of the potential functions at the source, in the same way as in [26]. It is remarkable that under the simple condition $\alpha_3 = 0$ and $\alpha_4 = -\alpha_1$ the complicated Eq. (7) has the form $(1-\mu(r))B(r,\mu(r)) = 0$, which obviously has a root $\mu(r) = 1$, since the function $B(r, \mu(r) = 1)$ is finite. This solution leads to very compact expressions for the potentials inside the Vainshtein radius

$$\nu_1(r) = -\lambda_1(r) = -\frac{r_S}{r} - \frac{r^2}{3}\left[\Lambda + m^2\sin^2(\theta)\left(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2\right)\right] , \tag{B16a}$$

$$\nu_2(r) = -\lambda_2(r) = -\frac{2}{3}\,\alpha_1 m^2 r^2 \cos^2(\theta) . \tag{B16b}$$

3. Matching of both Regimes

The five integration constants $C_{0,1,2,3,4}$ of the general, linearized solution can be fixed by matching to the solution in the non-linear regime at $r = r_V$. The resulting values are:

$$C_0 \Rightarrow \widetilde{\Lambda} = 0, \quad C_1 = r_S\,\cos^2(\theta)\left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\sin^2(\theta)\right), \quad C_2 = -2\,r_S\frac{\Lambda + m^2\alpha_1 + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(3\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)}{3m^2\alpha_1},$$
$$C_3 = -\cos^2(\theta) m\sqrt{\alpha_1}C_2, \quad C_4 = r_S\frac{5\Lambda + 3\alpha_1 m^2 + m^2\sin^2(\theta)(7\alpha_1 + 5\alpha_2)}{6\alpha_1^2 m^4}, \tag{B17}$$

with r_S being the Schwarzschild radius of the central matter distribution. To obtain these expressions, we have assumed that $r_S \ll r_V$ and kept only terms linear in r_S. However, the result for C_1 is valid independently of this approximation. Our result is the generalization of the special case given in Ref. [26].

---

[1] A. Einstein, Annalen Phys. **49**, 769 (1916), [Annalen Phys.14,517(2005)].

[2] S. Perlmutter et al. (Supernova Cosmology Project), Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999), astro-ph/9812133.

[3] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).

[4] J. Martin, Comptes Rendus Physique **13**, 566 (2012), 1205.3365.

[5] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B302**, 668 (1988).

[6] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2607 (1987).

[7] G. Dvali, S. Hofmann, and J. Khoury, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 084006 (2007), hep-th/0703027.

[8] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, L. Heisenberg, and D. Pirtskhalava, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 103516 (2011), 1010.1780.

[9] C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 044020 (2010), 1007.0443.

[10] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011), 1011.1232.

[11] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Lett. **B711**, 190 (2012), 1107.3820.

[12] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 041101 (2012), 1106.3344.

[13] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **07**, 009 (2011), 1103.6055.

[14] S. F. Hassan, R. A. Rosen, and A. Schmidt-May, JHEP **02**, 026 (2012), 1109.3230.

[15] D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti, and L. Pilo, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 101502 (2012), 1204.1027.

[16] C. Deffayet, J. Mourad, and G. Zahariade, JCAP **1301**, 032 (2013), 1207.6338.

[17] C. Deffayet, J. Mourad, and G. Zahariade, JHEP **03**, 086 (2013), 1208.4493.

[18] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **02**, 126 (2012), 1109.3515.

[19] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **04**, 123 (2012), 1111.2070.

[20] D. G. Boulware and S. Deser, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 3368 (1972).

[21] M. Fierz, Helv. Phys. Acta **12**, 3 (1939).

[22] M. Fierz and W. Pauli, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A173**, 211 (1939).

[23] K. Hinterbichler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 671 (2012), 1105.3735.

[24] C. de Rham, Living Rev. Rel. **17**, 7 (2014), 1401.4173.

[25] K. Giesel, S. Hofmann, T. Thiemann, and O. Winkler, Class. Quant. Grav. **27**, 055005 (2010), 0711.0115.

[26] E. Babichev and M. Crisostomi, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 084002 (2013), 1307.3640.

[27] E. Babichev and R. Brito, Class. Quant. Grav. **32**, 154001 (2015), 1503.07529.

[28] A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. **B39**, 393 (1972).

[29] E. Babichev, C. Deffayet, and R. Ziour, JHEP **05**, 098 (2009), 0901.0393.

[30] E. Babichev, C. Deffayet, and R. Ziour, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 201102 (2009), 0907.4103.

[31] E. Babichev, C. Deffayet, and R. Ziour, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 104008 (2010), 1007.4506.

[32] L. Alberte, A. H. Chamseddine, and V. Mukhanov, JHEP **12**, 023 (2010), 1008.5132.

[33] V. Baccetti, P. Martin-Moruno, and M. Visser, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 015004 (2013), 1205.2158.

[34] H. van Dam and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. **B22**, 397 (1970).

[35] V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **12**, 312 (1970), [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.12,447(1970)].

[36] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Georgi, and M. D. Schwartz, Annals Phys. **305**, 96 (2003), hep-th/0210184.

[37] C. de Rham, J. T. Deskins, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou (2016), 1606.08462.